

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ
 مُحَمَّدٌ وَآلِهِ عَلَى رُؤُوسِ الْكَرِيمِ

THE ISLAMIC REVIEW

JUMĀDA 'L-ŪLĀ, 1349 A.H.

VOL. XVIII.

OCTOBER, 1930 A.C.

No. 10

AFTER-EFFECTS OF THE GREAT WAR

By SHAIKH MUSHĪR HUSAIN KIDWĀ'Ī OF GADIA

(Barrister-at-Law)

(Continued from September (1930), "Islamic Review," p. 310.)

II. RATIONALITY OF ISLAM

The pivot of the Islamic Faith is its conception of God, and the pivot of all the phenomenal progress the Muslims made in a wonderfully short time in Science, in Culture, in Civilization is also the same Islamic conception of God. As to the Muslim Faith, no improvement is possible on it. The Islamic conception of God is as perfect as it could be. You cannot add anything to it; you cannot subtract anything from it. Islamic conception of God is not only the most chaste, sublime, and soul-elevating possible; it is also the most rational, so that even a sceptic cannot take exception to it. Gibbon says:

"The creed of Muhammad is free from suspicion or ambiguity; and the Qur-án is a glorious testimony to the unity of God. The Prophet of Mecca rejected the worship of idols and men, of stars and planets, on the rational principle that whatever rises must set, that whatever is born must die, that

ISLAMIC REVIEW

whatever is corruptible must decay and perish. In the Author of the Universe his rational enthusiasm confessed and adored an Infinite and Eternal Being, without form or place, without issue or similitude, present to our most secret thoughts, existing by the necessity of his own nature, and deriving from himself all moral and intellectual perfection. These sublime truths, thus announced in the language of the Prophet, are firmly held by his disciples and defined with his metaphysical precision. A philosophic theist might subscribe to the popular creed of the Muhammadans: a creed too sublime perhaps for our present faculties. What object remains for the fancy, or even the understanding, when we have abstracted from the unknown substance all ideas of time and space, of motion and matter, of sensation and reflection? The first principle of reason and revolution was confirmed by the voice of Muhammad: his proselytes, from India to Morocco, are distinguished by the name of *Unitarians*; and the danger of idolatry has been prevented by the interdiction of images."

Gibbon says that "a philosophic theist" can subscribe to Islam. I say that even a rationalistic athiest or agnostic would subscribe to the Islamic conception of God if he knows what that really is. Ingersoll, one of the avowed agnostics, has expressed nothing but admiration for Muslims. Every so-called atheist would do the same if he studied carefully and with a reasonable mind the philosophy of Islam. I say this after having very studiously read and digested almost all the "rationalist literature" in the English language. The God in Islam is the Creator of human reason, and without doubt He can satisfy the human reason as He does the yearnings of the human soul. The subject is too wide to be done justice to here. I, God willing, will write a separate thesis on this subject, and will now refer to a deficiency of the atheistic scientists. We know that Euclid conceived the idea of a point without any dimensions and built upon that an exact practical science. The scientists and atheists, while trying to find out the "how" and "why" of this wonderful universe, fail hopelessly and take refuge in agnosticism simply because they have not conceived anything like Euclid's point.

AFTER-EFFECTS OF THE GREAT WAR

Islam has supplied that deficiency and it is, therefore, that Islam has solved the mystery of the "how" and "why" of the universe and all that exists in it or even beyond it. Islam has solved the problems of life and of after-life, of this universe and of the Fashioner of this universe.

Haeckel, after pondering over the beauties of this "Wonderland" as he calls it, exclaims: "May God, the Spirit of Good, the Beautiful, and the True, be with us!" Islam believes that "Allah is the Light of Heavens and the Earth" first, and then begins to admire the universe. To a Muslim, God is not only "Good" and "Beautiful" and "True" but has also the attributes related in the following Qur-ānic verses:

"Howa 'l-Lāhu 'l-Lazī lā ilāhā ila 'l-Lāho 'ālīmu 'l-Ghaibi wa 's-Shāhāda, howa 'r-Rahmānu 'r-Rahīm" ("He is Allah, besides whom there is no God: the Knower of the unseen and the seen; He is the Beneficent, the Merciful").

"Howa 'l-Lāhu 'l-Lazī lā ilāhā illa hū, Al-Malīku 'l-Quddūsu 'l-Salāmu 'l-Mu'mīnu 'l-Muhamīnu 'l-'Azīzu 'l-Jabbāru 'l-Mutakabbir: subhāna 'l-Lāhi 'ammā yushriqūn" ("He is Allah, besides whom there is no God; the King, the Holy, the Author of Peace, the Granter of Security, Guardian over all, the Mighty, the Supreme, the Possessor of every greatness; Allah is more sublime than what they [peoples like Christians or Hindus] associate with Him").

"Howa 'l-Lāhu 'l-Khāliq 'l-Bārī'u 'l-Musawwir lahu 'l-Asmāu 'l-husnā, yusabbihu lahū mā fi 's-Samāwati wa 'l-Arzi, wa huwa 'l-'Azīzu 'l-Hakīm" ("He is Allah the Creator, the Maker, the Fashioner; His are the most excellent names; whatever is in the heaven and the earth declares His glory; and He is the Mighty, the Wise Scientist").

The philosophy of the Muslim belief itself is energizing. Western thinkers will be surprised to learn that the much misunderstood and also misapplied philosophy of Fate or *Taqdīr* itself is energizing. It was because of that belief that a true Muslim feared nothing in the world, not even death, and nobody, not even a tyrant. He was never despondent. He faced all troubles and calamities bravely. Failures

never upset or disheartened him. His spirit was indomitable. Upon their belief in *Taqḍīr* (Fate) rested to a large extent the zeal of the Muslims of old to find out the properties of all the natural things. God, they believed, had created everything for good. Nothing had been created in vain. Man could profit himself if he could find out the right measure of everything. He had been given free will enough to use every thing either rightly or wrongly. If he used wrongly he made the good thing evil for himself. God had been good enough to warn him that a line of demarcation had been made or a measure had been prefixed by God Himself for the use of every thing—*Wa 'l-qadri kharihī wa sharrihī mina 'l-Lāhi ta'ālā*. It is for man to find out what are the good capacities or propensities of a thing or an action, and what are the evil. He will have to be active and make a research so as to use a thing for his good. The great factory of Nature is constantly at work. The clouds float in the air. The burning sun rotates. The moon goes round the earth and the earth round the sun. The solar system has its own object and so forth. A Muslim poet beautifully says:

*“Abro bādo māh o khurshīd hama dar kār and
Tā to nāne bakaf ārī wa ba ghaflat na khurī”—*

(“The clouds and the air, the moon and the sun all are at work so that thou should labour for thy bread and not eat it in laziness”).

A Muslim is expected not to be idle but to be at work and to find out the laws and the mysteries and the hidden treasures in Nature. God, by natural process, preserved deep in the bosom of the earth large fields of coal. The properties given to the carbon-gas were fatal, but those of the coal could be turned into a matchless boon for industrial purposes. It was for man to unearth the coal. It was for man to use his intelligence and skill to protect himself from the gas while taking out the coal for beneficial purposes, and to make experiments. It was through experiments that he found out the pre-set or predestined measures of both gas and coal. Although the Great Prophet knew more than anybody else did of the secrets

AFTER-EFFECTS OF THE GREAT WAR

of Nature he was himself illiterate. This, however, did not prevent him from laying great stress upon the education of his followers. Professor Lake says: "The Islam of Muhammad also contained a germ which, when fully developed, has spread its influence in Europe and has been heavier on Western idolatry than its arms were upon the East. It began in the establishment of schools by Muhammad and, to assist in these and his educational plans, he released such of his prisoners of war as could read and write as soon as they had taught a certain number of boys to do the same, and if any were willing to remain and take charge of schools they were liberated at once."

The result of this earliest possible schooling of Muslims was that the followers of that Great Untutored Teacher began to write very soon after on subjects like these: history, statistics, travels, voyages, chronology, numismatics, gems, pulpit oratory, agriculture, rural economy, irrigation, pure and mixed mathematics, sciences, topography, geography, medicine, chemistry, zoology, botony, natural history, and geology. Professor Lake adds: "They were no triflers in those subjects." Europe could not tolerate one learned woman and burned her at the stake. Muslim Spain alone produced hundreds of learned and talented women like 'Āyesha, Walida, and Lubaina, who were respected by all. The juristic discourses and knowledge of 'Āyesha (the Prophet's beloved wife) were unsurpassed by her contemporary men. The library of Khalifa Al-Hakim was so large that its catalogue had to be prepared in forty volumes. Another Christian writer says: "When, therefore, in the midst of the wrangling of sects, in the uncomprehensible jargon of Arians, Nestorians, Eutychians, Monothelites, Monophysites, Mariolatrians, anarchy of countless disputants, there sounded through the world, not the miserable voices of the intriguing majority of a council, but the dread battle-cry, 'There is but one God!' enforced by the trumpets of Saracenic armies, is it surprising that the hubbub was hushed? Is it surprising that all Asia and Africa fell away? In better times patriotism is too often made subordinate to religion; in those times it was altogether dead.

Scarcely was Muhammad buried when his religion manifested its inevitable destiny of overpassing the bounds of Arabia."

Yes. The cry of "There is no god but God!" could not be confined to the narrow limits of Arabia or any one country. All the nations, all the religions, tried their very best to choke that cry in the mouth of the one man who had raised it. They left no stone unturned, no blood-spilling instrument unused, in the effort. The "trumpet of the Saracenic armies" had to be employed *not* to enforce the Islamic call or cry but to *defend* those very, very few who were endeavouring to help Muhammad to spread it the world over. It was impossible to silence that cry. It can be heard with greater strength and power to this day from every corner of this globe, and I feel inclined to think that when man will reach Mars or the moon he will hear the same cry, "*Lā Ilā'hā il 'l-Lāh!*" ("There is no god but God!") resounding in those planets also. That cry is really soul-stirring; it is really world-conquering. Carlyle eloquently described its effects thus: "A poor shepherded people, roaming unnoticed in its deserts since the creation of this world; a Hero Prophet was sent down to them with a word they could believe; see, the unnoticed becomes world-noticeable. The small has grown world-great; within the century afterwards Arabia is at Granada on this hand, at Delhi on that, glancing with valour and splendour and the light of genius. . . . Arabia shines through lone ages over a section of the world."

(To be continued.)

MUHAMMAD: A BRAHMAN SCHOLAR'S APPRECIATION

By PROFESSOR HARI PRASAD SHASTRI, Ph.D.

WE enjoy the beauties of Nature, and delight in the charms of music and poetry. We feel uplifted when we read Plato or Shakespeare; and we are elevated when we meditate on the profound metaphysics of Shanker or the sublime ethics of Shakyamuni. But we feel a special inner pleasure when we

A BRAHMAN SCHOLAR'S APPRECIATION

contemplate a great personality, great on account of the contributions made by it to civilization and the cause of truth. Here we feel ourselves to be face to face with truth embodied in a person, and the charm of such a personality exercises over us greater influence than any other. It not only elevates us morally and spiritually, but also expands our horizon of consciousness, and gives us peeps into that mysterious region which is the source of inspiration and real freedom. God is not comprehensible through our reason or senses, but it is the force of a person who has realized God within that fills us with an intuitional knowledge of God and makes us living spiritual dynamos. A touch of such a divine man makes us fearless, philanthropic, and inspired. Such a personality was the holy Prophet Muhammad of Arabia; perhaps the last of those great men of God who come to give a divine message to humanity.

Born in a family of great distinction in Arabia, this great and holy man was noted for his love of truth and sense of justice from his very childhood. He was not a precocious but an ideal child. He did not need worldly knowledge to be moral, for what can the learned of the world teach except fragments of that truth which Muhammad brought with him? He entered business, and proved beyond doubt that one could be a successful business man and yet remain honest. If Confucius had known of the business principles of Muhammad, he would have thought twice before condemning mercantile pursuits.

That physical beauty is only skin deep, and matrimonial ties must rest on moral beauty which abides, was proved by this great man when he married Lady Khadija, a woman of surpassing spiritual wealth and a great lover of truth.

We see the real Muhammad in his fortieth year, when through the sheer force of his high moral principles and great introspective powers he realized God within himself, and felt the great call of giving the divine truth of the unity of God and sovereignty of ethics to mankind. A humanity plunged in the mud of materialism, thinking the physical pleasures to be the only thing worth loving, blind to the beauties of faith

and divine consciousness represented as the Unity of God or Life, needed a new messenger from God; and Arabia furnished one. It was one of the most outstanding events in the history of the world when this Arabian youth realized in a cave the great truth that nothing but Allah was worthy of our reverence. Here was created a force that was to give a death-blow to the Roman Empire founded on slavery and personal extravagance, and to introduce a great civilization into the dark Europe. Muhammad called his movement "Islam," meaning "peace," and he fully meant it to be a peace-giving institution: peace to the troubled soul of man, and peace to the world sunk in ignorance of God.

If Muhammad was not a messenger of God, then I can say that God never sent a Prophet, and the conception is unfounded.

This holy Prophet literally lived what he taught. He incarnated in himself the principles of democracy, tolerance, highest ethics, charity, love, simplicity, etc. His disregard for worldly riches, honour, power, etc., was transparent. He loved Truth and God above all and followed it to the best of his capacity. He never made a compromise in his life, and never feared man. His courage was almost superhuman.

He did not teach shibboleths that remain only as an ideal. He taught what every man can practise and be uplifted by it. There was no duality in his teachings. He not only loved the poor, but taught the principle of "zakat," which, if reduced to practice as a national policy, is sure to abolish poverty. He condemned the use of alcohol and other intoxicants over thirteen hundred years ago. To-day America is copying him, and Japan, which stands at the brink of moral ruination on account of unrestricted use of alcohol, is seriously considering the introduction of prohibition.

"Go to China for love of learning." This is a saying of the Holy Prophet. The great Tang dynasty ruled in China at the time of the Prophet, and learning was at its zenith in his time. When Europe was sunk in ignorance and filth, when witches were burnt alive in the capitals of Europe, and learning was hated as poison, the followers of Islam were opening schools in every village in Spain and teaching science,

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

art, philosophy, and literature. The name of Al-Farasi and the fame of Abubaker are written in bold letters in the history of philosophy in Europe.

Like Buddhism, Islam was not only a religious movement but also a great civilizing force. What Buddhism did to the north of Asia by way of giving a great culture, Islam did to the north of Africa and Europe. Aristotle was introduced to Europe through the Muslims, who taught his philosophy in Spain. Paper was their gift to Europe. The Alhambra Court in the Crystal Palace of London gives a little idea of the architectural beauty introduced by the Muslims into Spain. Peace is writ on the Muslim art.

The Holy Prophet did not indulge in self-superiority. God alone was worthy of all honour, reverence, worship, and his personality. He was never tired of emphasizing his equality with other men. Muslims and non-Muslims were equal in his eyes, as they are in the eyes of Allah. His hospitality was open alike to Muslims and non-Muslims.

Expansion of the individual consciousness to infinity is the only way to complete freedom from all limitations of time, tradition, sin, or sorrow. The Holy Prophet teaches his followers to plunge themselves into the infinite consciousness of Allah five times a day, preparing them to enter the nirvana of peace and bliss. What religion could teach more than this?

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

By PROFESSOR 'ABDU 'L-AHAD DĀWŪD, B.D.

VI

THE "SIBGHATU 'L-LĀH," OR THE BAPTISM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT AND WITH FIRE

[The learned Professor is open to correspondence on questions which may be suggested by the articles written by him. Letters can be addressed to him care of the Editor, the *Islamic Review*, Woking, England.—ED. I.R.]

ONE of the few religious phenomena I have not been able to explain is this: How is it that the well-known Saba'ites (Sabians),

so predominant in the Arabian peninsula and Mesopotamia, did not embrace Christianity if the Prophet John the Baptist had really and openly declared and presented Jesus as the "more powerful" Prophet than himself, and the Messiah whose shoes he was not worthy to unloose? If, as foretold by John, Jesus was the Apostle of Allah who came to baptize with the Holy Spirit and with fire the myriads whom he "dyed" in the water of the Jordan and elsewhere, why did not Jesus baptize them instantly with the Spirit and with fire and then purge of idolatry all the lands promised by Allah to the seed of Abraham and establish the Kingdom of God by force and fire? It is absolutely inconceivable that the disciples and the believers in the divine mission of John should not follow Jesus if he had been presented to the public as his Lord or Superior on the spot. The followers of John might have been excused for their refusal to enter into the Christian Church if Jesus Christ had come, say, a century later than the Baptist, but happily such was not the case. They were both contemporaries and born in the same year. They both baptized with water unto repentance, and prepared their penitent converts for the Kingdom of God that was approaching but not established in their time.

The Saba'ites, the "Dyers" or "Baptists," were the faithful adherents of John. They may have fallen into error and superstition; but they knew perfectly well that it was not Jesus who was intended in the prophecy of their Prophet. They embraced Islam when Muhammad came. The people of Harran in Syria are *not*—as they have been supposed to be—the remnant of the old Saba'ites. In the promised lands only three non-Muslim religions were recognized and tolerated by the Qur-án, namely, Judaism, Christianity, and Sabianism. It is stated that the Harranians pretended to be the remnant of the old Saba'ites, and they were, therefore, permitted to practise their peculiar religion without molestation by the Turkish Government.

The Christian conception of the Holy Spirit is entirely different from the Islamic and the Jewish. The Holy Spirit is not a divine person with divine attributes and functions

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

not belonging to this or that other divine person of a triple god. The Christian belief that this same holy ghost, the third divine person, descends from his (or her, or its) heavenly throne at the bidding of every priest—in his daily celebration of some sacrament—to consecrate its elements and change their essence and qualities into some supernatural elements is extremely repugnant to the religious sentiments of every Unitarian, whether Jew or Muslim. Nothing could horrify a Muslim's feeling more than the belief that the Holy Spirit—always at the intervention of a priest—changes the water of baptism into the blood of a crucified god and blots out the so-called original sin; or a belief that the magic operation upon the material elements of the Eucharist transubstantiates them into the blood and body of an incarnate god. These beliefs were absolutely opposed to the teachings of the Old Testament and a falsification of the real doctrine of John and Jesus. The Christian assertion that the Holy Spirit, at the incantations of a priest, fills certain individuals and sanctifies them, but does not guarantee their impeccability and ignorance, is meaningless. We are told that Hananiah (Ananias) and his wife Shapirah were baptized, which is to say filled with the Holy Ghost. They were thus inspired by the third divine person to sell their field and to place its price in cash at the feet of the Apostle Peter, but at the same time were seduced by the devil to conceal a portion of the money. The consequence was that the unfortunate communist couple were stricken dead miraculously (Acts v.).

Think of the belief that the Third Person of the Trinity descends upon men, sanctifies them, and then allows them to fall into error, heresy, and atheism, and abandons them to commit murderous wars and massacres. Is this possible? Can the devil seduce a man filled with and guarded by the Holy Ghost and change him into a demon? The Holy Qur-án is very expressive on this point. Allah says to the devil:

“ Verily thou shalt have no power over my servants, but over those only who shall be seduced and who shall follow thee ” (chap. xv.).

We cannot believe, nor even imagine for a moment, that a servant of God, a righteous believer who has received the Spirit of sanctification, can fall into a deadly sin and perish in hell. Nay, a holy person, so long as he is in this material world, is to combat and struggle against sin and evil; he may fall, but he will rise again and shall never be abandoned by the pure Spirit that guards him. True repentance is the work of the good Spirit that lives in us. If a Christian be baptized with the Holy Spirit and fire, in the sense which the book of the "Acts of the Apostles" describes and the Churches accept, then every baptized Latin, Greek, or Abyssinian must not only become a sinless saint but also a linguist and a polyglot prophet!

The truth is that the Christians have not a definite or precise conception about the Holy Spirit filling a baptized Christian. If it be God, then how dare the devil approach, tempt, and seduce the hallowed or rather deified man? And, besides, what is more serious is: How can the devil chase away the Holy Ghost and settle himself in the heart of a baptized heretic or atheist? On the other hand, if the Holy Spirit means the Archangel Gabriel or some other angel, then the Christian Churches roam in a desert of superstition; for an angel is not omnipresent. If this Spirit that purifies and fills a baptized Christian is *God Himself*, for such is their belief in the Third Person of the Trinity, then all the baptized Christians ought to claim themselves divine or deified.

Then there is a Protestant conception of the Holy Spirit, which (or who ¹) fills the hearts of those who, at the highest excitement and ecstasy during an inflammatory sermon of an ignorant or learned haranguer, believe themselves to become "new-born"; yet many among them slide back and become what they were before, rogues and swindlers!

Now before I come to explain, according to my humble understanding, the spiritual and fiery baptism, I wish to admit and confess that there are many pious and God-fearing persons

¹ The Holy Spirit, in all the Christian literature of diverse languages, has not a fixed gender. He, she, it, are all commonly used as the personal pronouns for the Holy Ghost.

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

among the Jews and the Christians. For however their religious views and beliefs may differ from ours, they love God and do good in His name. We cannot comprehend and determine the dealings of God with the peoples of different religions. The Christian conception of the Deity is only an erroneous definition of the true God in whom they believe and love. If they extol Jesus and deify him, it is not that they wish to dishonour God, but because they see His beauty in that Ruḥ-Allah (the "Spirit of God," i.e. Jesus). They certainly cannot appreciate the Apostleship of Muhammad, not because they deny his unparalleled service to the cause of God by inflicting the greatest blow on the devil and his cult of idolatry, but because they do not understand as *he* did the true nature of the mission and person of Jesus Christ. Similar reasoning may be put forward with regard to the attitude of the Jews towards Jesus and Muhammad. God is Merciful and Forgiving!

The Holy Spirit, with the definite article "the," means a special angelic personality, Gabriel, or any one of the numerous "pure" spirits created by Allah, and appointed to perform some particular mission. The descent of the Holy Spirit upon a human person is to reveal to him the will and the oracles of Allah, and to make him a prophet. Such an one can *never* be seduced by the satan.

The baptism with the Holy Spirit and fire which Muhammad brought is explained to us by the divine revelation only in one verse of Al-Qur-án:

"The Baptism of God (have we received), and who is better than God to baptize? Him do we worship" (chap. ii.).

This is the translation of Sale (cf. *The Koran*).

The Muslim commentators rightly understand the word "Sibghat," not in its literal signification of "dyeing," but in its spiritual or metaphorical sense of "religion." This Qur-ánic verse cancels and abolishes the religions of the "Sab'ūtha" and of the "Ma'mudītha" of both the Saba'ites and the Naṣāra. "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh" is the baptism of the religion of Allah, not with water, but with the Holy Spirit and fire!

ISLAMIC REVIEW

The religion professed by any of the companions of the Apostle of Allah in the first years of the Hijrat is to-day professed in its entirety by every Muslim. This cannot be said of the baptismal religion. *More than sixteen Œcumenical Councils have been summoned to define the religion of Christianity*, only to be discovered by the Synod of the Vatican in the nineteenth century that the mysteries of the "Infallibility" and the "Immaculate Conception" were two of the principal dogmas, both unknown to the Apostle Peter and the Blessed Virgin Mary! Any faith or religion dependent upon the deliberations and decisions of General Synods—holy or heretical—is artificial and human. The religion of Islam is the belief in one Allah and absolute resignation to His Will, and this faith is professed by the angels in heaven and by the Muslims on earth. It is the religion of sanctification and of enlightenment, and an impregnable bulwark against idolatry. Let us develop these points a little further.

The spiritual baptism is the direct work of God Himself. As a fuller or a laundress washes the linen or any other object with water; as a dyer tints the wool or cotton with a tincture to give it a new hue; and as a baptist blots out the past sins of the true penitent believer, so does God Almighty baptize, *not* the body, but the spirit and the soul of him whom He mercifully directs and guides unto the Holy Religion of Islam. This is the "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh," the Baptism of Allah, which makes a person fit and dignified to become a citizen of the Kingdom of Allah and a member of His religion. When the Angel Gabriel communicated the Word of Allah for the first time to Muhammad, he (Muhammad) was invested with the gift of prophecy. His spirit was purified and magnified with the Holy Spirit to such a degree and extent that when he in his turn pronounced that Word to those whose spirit Allah pleased to guide were also purified, baptized. They, too, thus became holy officers in the new army of the faithful Muslims. This spiritual baptism does not make the Muslims prophets, sinless saints, or miracle-mongers. For after the Revelation of the Will and Word of Allah in the Holy Qur-ān there is the end of the prophecy and of revelation. They are

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

not made sinless saints because their piety and good works would not be the outcome of effort and struggle against evil, and therefore not justly meritorious. They are not appointed to become workers of supernatural miracles because they have a firm and sound faith in their Lord.

Further, this "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh" makes the true Muslims grave, constant in their duties to Allah and towards their fellowmen, especially towards their families. *It does not move them to the folly of believing themselves holier than their co-religionists, and so to arrogate the post of pastorship to themselves over others as if they were their flocks and herds. Fanaticism, religious conceit, and the like are not operations of the Holy Spirit. Every Muslim receives at his creation the same "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh," the same religion and spiritual baptism, and has to run the race of his short earthly life to the best of his ability and effort in order to win the crown of glory in the next world. Every Muslim needs only education and religious training in accordance with the wisdom of the Word of God. But he needs not the intercession of a priest, sacrament, or saint. Every enlightened believer can become an Imām, a missionary, a preacher according to his learning and religious zeal, not for vain glory or lucrative gain.*

In short, every Muslim, whether at his birth or at his conversion, is baptized spiritually, and becomes a citizen of the Kingdom of God, a free man, and possesses equal rights and obligations, according to his ability, virtue, knowledge, wealth, rank.

St. John the Baptist ascribes this spiritual and igneous baptism to the Great Apostle of Allah, not as a divine being, God, or son of God, but as a holy agent, and as an instrument through which this divine baptismal sacrament was to be operated. Muhammad delivered the Message of Allah which was His Word; he led the prayers, administered the divine service, and fought the holy wars against the unbelievers and the idolators to defend his cause. But the success and the victory achieved was God's. In the same way John preached and baptized, but the contrition, penance, and the remission of sins could only be done by God. The Prophet John's

prediction that "he who comes after me is more powerful than I; he will baptize you with the Spirit and with fire" is quite intelligible, because only through Muhammad this spiritual baptism was given and performed.

It is to be remarked that the *form* and *material* of this baptism is altogether divine and supernatural. We feel and see the effect of an invisible but real cause which accomplishes that effect. There is no longer water as the material, nor a baptist to officiate at the ritual or the form. It is God who, through the Spirit, works it out. The materials of the "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh" in the words of the Baptist are the Holy Spirit and fire. The form exclusively belongs to Allah. We cannot attribute to the Almighty any form of operation except His Word "Kun"—"Be!"—and His command is obeyed or created. The result is that a Muslim becomes sanctified, enlightened, and an equipped soldier to fight the Satan and his idolatry. These three effects of the "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh" deserve a serious consideration and study. Their exposition is but brief.

1. The Holy Spirit, whether the Archangel Gabriel or another of the created Superior Spirits, by the command of God sanctifies the spirit of a Muslim at his birth or conversion—as the case may be; and this sanctification means:

(a) Engraving a perfect faith in the one true God. The "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh" makes the spirit of a true Muslim believe in the absolute unity of Allah, to rely upon Him, and to know He alone is his Master, Owner, and Lord. This faith in the true God is manifest in every person who professes himself a Muslim. The mark and the evidence of this ingrained faith in a Muslim shines brilliantly when he affirms, "Anā muslim, Alḥamud li 'l-Lāhi ("I am Muslim; praised be Allah!"). What is more impressive and singularly obvious a sign of a holy faith than the hatred and repugnance which a Muslim feels against any other object of worship besides God? Which of the two is holier in the sight of God: he who worships his Creator in a simple building of the Mosque, or he who worships the fourteen pictures and images representing the scenes of the Crucifixion in a building whose walls and altars are adorned with the idolatrous statues, its ground covering the bones of

MUHAMMAD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

the dead, and its dome decorated with the figures of angels and the saints?

(b) The sanctification by the Holy Spirit and fire which God works upon the spirit of a Muslim is that He impregnates and fills it with love for, and submission to, Him. An honourable husband would rather divorce his beloved consort than see her sharing his love with any other man. The Almighty will cast away any "believer" who associates any other object or being with Him. The Muslim's love for Allah is not theoretical or idealistic but practical and real. He will not hesitate for a moment to expel from his house his wife, son, or friend if he should blaspheme the Holy Name or Person. A pagan or a person of other religion may show a similar furious zeal for his object of worship. But that love which is shown for the One True God is holy and sanctified; and such love can only exist in the heart of a Muslim. Those auspicious and doxological formulæ "Bismi 'l-Lāhi" and "Alḥamdu li 'l-Lāhi," which mean, respectively, "In the name of Allah" and "Praised be Allah" at the beginning and the end of every action or enterprise, are the most sincere expressions of the purified Muslim spirit impressed and inebriated with the "Love of God" that transcends and excels every other love. These ejaculations are not artificial or hypocritical expressions in the mouths of Muslims, but they are the prayer and the praise of the baptized spirit that resides in his body. And if a Christian and a Jew are imbued with the same faith and devotion, and if their soul does effuse those expressions that the spirit of a Muslim does, then he is a Muslim though he knows it not.

(c) The baptismal sanctification which the "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh" inspires in the spirit of a Unitarian Muslim, besides faith and love, is a total submission and resignation to the holy will of God. This absolute submission emanates not only from faith and love, but also from a holy fear and from a deep respect so latent in the soul and spirit of every true believer.

Such are the principal characteristics of the spiritual baptism, and nowhere are they manifest but among the adherents of Islam. John the Baptist, Jesus Christ and his

ISLAMIC REVIEW

apostles believed in, loved, and feared the same Allah as every Muslim does according to the degree of the divine grace and mercy. The Holy Spirit himself, too, is a creature and loves and fears the same Allah whom you and I do.

2. The second mark of the spiritual baptism is enlightenment. The true knowledge of Allah and of His will, so much as men are enabled to possess, can only and exclusively be seen in Muslims. This knowledge sparkles dazzlingly in the countenance and the general behaviour of every Muslim. He may not comprehend the essence and the person of God, just as a child cannot understand the nature and the qualities of his parents; yet a baby recognizes its mother among all other women. The analogy is by far below the reality, and the comparison infinitely inferior between an enlightened good Muslim in relation to his Creator and a baby crying after its own good mother. Every Muslim, however ignorant, poor, and sinful, sees the signs of Allah in every phenomenon of the nature. Whatever befalls him, in happiness or misery, Allah is in his mind. The Muslim call to prayer is a living witness of this enlightenment. "There is no object of worship besides Allah," is an eternal protest against all those who associate with Him other objects unworthy of worship. Every Muslim confesses: "I witness that God is the only Being worthy of worship."

In this respect I may hint at the fact that the human soul is quite different from the human spirit. It is this holy spirit that enlightens the soul and implants in it the knowledge of truth. It is again the evil spirit that induces the soul to error, idolatry, and ungodliness.

3. The "Sibghatu 'l-Lāh" is that divine baptism with fire which arms and equips the Muslim to become a bulwark against error and superstition, chiefly against idolatry of every kind. It is this baptismal fire that melts the soul and spirit of a Muslim, thus separating its golden substance from the rubbish and ordure. It is the power of God which strengthens and consolidates the union between Him and the believing servant, and arms him to fight for the religion of God. The fervour and the zeal of the Muslim for Allah and His religion

QUR-ĀNIC CONCEPTION OF GODHOOD

is unique and holy. The savages also fight for their fetishes, the heathen for their idols, and the Christians for their cross; but what a contrast between these unworthy objects of worship and the God of Islam!

In conclusion, I must draw the attention of my Muslim brethren to think who they are; to remember the favours of Allah; and to live accordingly.

THE QUR-ĀNIC CONCEPTION OF GODHOOD

By WAZĪR AHMAD

NATURAL THEOLOGY AND DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

A FREETHINKER suggests that the conception of God is only an evolutionary growth, and there are obvious reasons to justify his contention. Man's natural instinct for worship wanted something to adore. Fear and hope, in conjunction with a sense of his own helplessness, induced primitive man to worship some unseen power. He approached the Deity his own hands had fashioned with awe and respect, and sought for names whereby to address it, and then all that he revered as best and most excellent became focussed on this Deity.

In time, increasing knowledge led him to revise his original conception of God. Like an idolator who brings every day fresh flowers to the idol he adores, and removes those that are withered and decayed, man had perforce to add new names and attributes to his already existing catalogue of the Divine morals, and delete old ones to make room for them. I am afraid that a Freethinker is right enough in his judgment here when even an accepted Revealed Theology does not seem able to suggest any improvement on his theory. All Divine morals have been fashioned more or less on the lines of human morality. The Formal Church, it is contended, made a departure in this respect. It introduced into the world a new Epiphany with its message "God is Love," and it said that

God's love found its expression in His sacrifice of Himself on the Cross to save humanity from eternal damnation and to cleanse human nature from innate and original sin. I have no wish to touch on the polemical side of the question; but unfortunately dogmatic theology cannot be supported by reference to either natural theology or to the general conduct of those who profess and call themselves Christians. Many of them are as innocent of righteousness as are those outside the pale of Christianity.

Enough has been written in these pages by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din to show the differences that distinguish the God of Islam from an anthropomorphic God. It is not man, as the learned Khwaja so lucidly shows, who gave his morals to God, but it is God Who fashioned man after His own image and created in man a capacity to follow Him in the observance of His morals. Nature that existed thousands of years before man came on the earth constantly exhibited in their highest development such morals as are claimed as our own by us to-day. Nature indexes the Great Mind; so the morals in dispute were God's and not ours.

But the Qur-án speaks also of such Divine morals as could not have belonged to man in the ordinary course of events, though he may become an instrument for their exhibition. By way of example I give the following verse from the Qur-án:

" Say: O Allah, Master of the kingdom! Thou givest the kingdom to whomsoever Thou pleasest and takest away the kingdom from whomsoever Thou pleasest, and Thou exaltest whom Thou pleasest and abasest whom Thou pleasest; in Thine hand is the good; surely, Thou hast power over all things " (iii. 25).

The events in the Great War, and after, fully proved the truth of these sacred words. Emperors and rulers were put down from their thrones and their places given to those who had no claim to them. Many were exalted and many were brought low. Can *all* these things have been of man's doing? Could man exercise powers so mighty as those which the last score of years have witnessed? There is nowhere a record

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE MUSLIM LAW

of any such events having occurred since the day when the Qur-ānic Revelation was given. Here is an illustration of the conception of God which the Qur-ān brought to humanity. One may speak of God as the Merciful, the Compassionate, the True, and the Omnipotent. These are all aspects of the Eternal, familiar to man though assuming a magnified form in the case of the Deity. The theory of the Secular Church in this respect may perhaps be entertainable, but what can that Church produce by way of answer to the verses I have quoted?

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE MUSLIM LAW

By M. AHMED, M.A., LL.M., Ph.D. (Barrister-at-Law)

MAXIMS

ARTICLE I.—“*Fiqh*” is the knowledge of the practical rules of “*Shari‘at*” together with the authorities on which they are based.

“*Fiqh*” is concerned with this world as well as the next. The portion concerned with the next world is called “*Ibādāt*” (religious practices), and that relating to this world is divided into “*Munakihat*” (marriages), “*Mu‘āmalāt*” (civil transactions), and “*Uqūbāt*” (punishments). God having ordained the maintenance of this world for a certain period known to Himself, the continuance of the human race therein is a matter of the first importance. Hence the laws regulating marriage are first dealt with. They are followed by laws relating to transactions of a civil nature which are essential to the existence of society. Finally punishments are necessary in order to enforce orders and compliance with laws. This explains the subdivision of “*fiqh*” as given above.

In the *Maraqat* “*fiqh*” is defined as “the science of man, his rights and duties.” Etymologically the word “*fiqh*” meant “knowledge.” It then came to be applied specially to a knowledge of the “*shari‘at*” or the legal provisions derived from clear ordinances from God and His Prophet.

According to Aristotle, justice consists in giving to the

deserving what is due to them and in the proportion in which it is deserved. He divided it into three kinds: (1) what a man owes to others, (2) what people owe to one another, (3) what a man owes to himself. (Cf. Justinian's definition, "Justum vivere alteram non lodere, jus suum quique dedere.")

ARTICLE II.—*Acts are judged by their motives. That is, a juristic result would be based on what was intended by an act. Consequently, if a man discharges an arrow, intending to kill game, but it struck and killed a man, the archer would not be sentenced to death.*

A man is justified in picking up a thing in the street with the intention of restoring it to its owner, but if he picks it up with the intention of appropriating it for his own use he is guilty of misappropriation.

ARTICLE III.—*In contracts regard is had for the object and intention of the contracting parties, and not for the words (used by them). It is for this reason that "Bai 'bi'l wafā" is treated as a mortgage.*

For although the contracting parties call the contract "a sale," their real object is to secure a debt.

ARTICLE IV.—*What is certain cannot be rebutted by what is doubtful. If it is certain that a man has given a loan to another and there is doubt as to whether it has been repaid, the loan stands.*

The principle is the same as in the next maxim: "Everything is presumed to remain in its original state (until the contrary is proved)."

ARTICLE V.—*Everything is presumed to remain in its original state (until the contrary is proved). Hence, if a man purchases something from another and leaves it with the seller and later returns to take its delivery and alleges that it has been changed, the seller can urge that it has remained in its original state until (the alteration) is proved otherwise.*

In the same way, if a portion of a house belonging to A and B is sold to C by A, and B claims "shufa," C may deny that B has any right in the portion sold until the contrary is proved. On the same principle, a person whose whereabouts are not known neither inherits nor is inherited from.

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE MUSLIM LAW

ARTICLE VI.—*Old things are presumed to remain in their original state. For example, a roadway, a channel, or the bed of a stream is assumed to be in its original state until it is proved that it has been altered.*

The principle is the same as in the previous maxim, namely, “Everything is presumed to remain in its original state (until the contrary is proved).” If it has been agreed to in the past that everyone through whose lands a certain canal flows is to take his supply of water from a specified sluice made for his benefit, it is not lawful for anyone to make a new minor channel or to set up a mill or a Persian wheel on the canal or to bridge it or widen its mouth or to take water therefrom in any other way.

ARTICLE VII.—*Wrongs are never too old to mend, i.e. antiquity is no excuse for perpetuating what is patently harmful. For instance, if there is a drain of foul water along a public road it can certainly be interdicted, in spite of its antiquity.*

It is unlawful to injure another or to cause mutual injury. When the injury is manifest, no question of antiquity arises. The owner of a cesspool, however old, will be compelled to prevent its water from running into a public pathway.

ARTICLE VIII.—*Everyone is presumed to be innocent. When a man has destroyed another man's property and they differ about the quantity of the property damaged, the statement of the person who damaged the property is presumed to be correct. The burden of proof is on the owner if he asserts an excess.*

The principle is that a defendant should not be made to pay more than is justly due from him.

ARTICLE IX.—*Accidental additions are supposed to be non-existent until proved. For instance, if there is a dispute between A, the owner of property, and B, his partner (who contributes his labour towards the partnership), as to whether profits did or did not accrue, B's statement (that they did not) will be presumed to be correct and it will be for the owner to prove that profits accrued.*

The principle is that accretions are not to be presumed. On the same principle, if the existence of a debt is proved by admission or other evidence and the debtor alleges that it has been repaid and the creditor denies it, the creditor will be

presumed to be right until the debtor proves the payment alleged by him.

ARTICLE X.—*What has been proved to exist at one time will be presumed to continue until the contrary is proved. Hence, if it is proved that a thing is owned by A, it will be presumed to continue to belong to him until his ownership is proved to have ceased.*

The principle is as laid down in maxim V: "Everything is presumed to remain in its original state until the contrary is proved." (Cf. the "Mālikī" and "Shāfi'ī" doctrine of presumption that a state of things which is not proved to have ceased still continues.

ARTICLE XI.—*An event is presumed to have occurred at a comparatively recent time. That is, when there is a dispute as to the time of the occurrence of an event, it will be presumed to have occurred at the most recent time unless it is proved to have occurred at a remote period.*

For instance, if a Muslim dies after marrying a non-Muslim lady in a Muslim country, and in order to inherit his property she alleges that she had accepted Islam before his death and his heir claims that she embraced Islam after his death, the heir's assertion will be presumed to be correct unless she proves her claim. In the same way a vendor's statement that a defect has developed while the property was in the purchaser's possession will be presumed to be correct.

On the same principle, if a *propositus* dies after bequeathing a portion of his property in favour of A, and A claims that the bequest was made before and the heirs allege that it was made after the *propositus* contracted mortal sickness, the heir's assertion will be presumed to be correct and the burden of proof will lie on A.

Likewise, if a widow claimed that she was divorced by her husband during the latter's mortal sickness, so that she is entitled to inherit from him, her assertion will be presumed to be correct and her right of inheritance to be valid.

ARTICLE XII.—*Words are presumed to have been used in their ordinary sense. That is, words will be interpreted in their natural sense when there is no indication to the contrary.*

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE MUSLIM LAW

For instance, if a man makes a "waqf" of his property in favour of his son and bequeaths a legacy in favour of B's son, the son's son is not admitted to the benefit if there is a son living. But in the absence of the latter, the son's son may benefit by it. (There is a difference of opinion as to whether a daughter's son will be entitled in the absence of son's son.) If a posthumous son was born to the *propositus* afterwards, the property will revert to him from the son's son. For the word "son" refers to his own son and has been used in the singular. If the word "Aulād" (sons or progeny) was used by the "waqif," then all his descendants will benefit.

ARTICLE XIII.—*Express words preclude the possibility of implication. For instance, if A takes a piece of cloth from B, a draper, and walks away with it saying, "I take it for 10 (coins)," and the draper asserts, "I will not give it for less than 11 (coins)," A, the purchaser, will be held responsible for 11 coins, and the fact that B, the seller, left the cloth with A will not be treated as having given his implied consent to sell it for 10 coins.*

Implication is always weak as compared with express direction. Hence the latter is preferred.

ARTICLE XIV.—*There is no occasion for "Ijtihād" (arriving at a new solution based on authority) where there is a clear order on the subject in the Qur-ān, that is, where the meaning is clear, as in the Qur-ānic verse, "God had legalized sale and counter-manded usury." No order passed at variance with this verse is valid.*

In the same way, although a "shafi" Kāzī authorizes the consumption of meat not killed in the orthodox Muslim manner (i.e. without the repetition of the formula "Bismillahi Allahu Akbar" at the time of killing), the Kāzī's decision will be treated as a dead letter because it is opposed to the Qur-ānic verse which reads, "Do not eat what has been killed on which God's name has not been recited." A valid "Ijtihād" must be in conformity with the authority.

ARTICLE XV.—*A departure proved or authorized does not legalize other departures.*

For example, the fact that the Prophet held Huzaima's evidence to be equivalent to the testimony of two witnesses

does not authorize a departure from the general rule of evidence, which requires the testimony of at least two witnesses to prove a fact in favour of persons other than Huzaima.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

By AL-HAJJ KHWAJA KAMAL-UD-DIN

I HAVE been asked by a friend from Bengal, India, to reply to the following two questions:

- (1) If Muslim sacrifices are meant to atone for sins, are they not of a piece with ceremonial piety in other religions?
- (2) If it is the faculties of forces in Nature which are meant by *Malak*—the Arabic word for *Angel*—how do you explain angels' visits to some men, as recorded in some books?

THE FEAST OF SACRIFICES

According to the teaching of the Holy Qur-án, sacrifices do not atone for sin. Islam is the religion of action and responsibility. It cannot give countenance to such doctrines that lead man to shift his burden to the shoulders of others.

The institution of sacrifice came into vogue with the appearance of man on earth. It was established to find occasions for charity and benevolence to be extended to others as the very word "feast" denotes. Animal flesh is a delicacy and a nutritive food of the best quality. The world is not without the poor and needy. They cannot afford to make flesh an article of daily food. Sacrifices and other forms of charity are meant chiefly to feed such unfortunate members of the human race. They are an act of piety that pleases God.

Good actions do weaken and destroy in the long run sinning aptitudes in man. They appease the wrath of God against a sinner. Piety demands some sort of sacrifice, as we have to part with things we care for or love to have. Sin in almost all various manifestations consists in depriving others of their rightful possessions, including the right of keeping body and property safe from harm. But if, under the urge of piety, we willingly part with things so dear to us, we naturally will shun

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

to snatch them away from others in unrighteous ways.¹ Thus actions of virtue kill unrighteousness, as the Qur-án says, and please the Great Moral Governor.² Sacrifices, though ceremonial piety, have the same effect on us as an act of charity, but are not to be regarded as an atonement for sin. They serve as a factor to curb sinning tendency in us.

Unfortunately the institution of sacrifices gradually assumed the character of atonement. Righteousness is irksome. For human nature, in its nascent stage, would like to shift its burden on to others' shoulders—a tendency which should not be allowed in the interests of the strengthening of the sense of responsibility in us.³ Owing to this inherent weakness man has always looked for something to expiate his evil. Jesus was not the only Christ that was invented by him to relieve us all of our burdens. He was the last of the race who got the story of Atonement clung to their necks. Many Christs, before the time of Jesus, were taken to the Altar of the Deity, and each one of them gave his life to secure the imagined salvation. They one and all subjected themselves to death willingly, whereas Jesus wanted "to have the cup passed from him."⁴ This scheme of salvation from eternal perdition came from paganism to Christianity. The Early Fathers wanted to supplement it with their own creed; they introduced almost all pagan tenets into their church to make it popular.

The blood and flesh of the sacrificed animal does not reach God. It is the spirit of benevolence to others that this institution works out in man, provided that he keeps the real object in view that reaches God.

¹ "By no means shall you attain to righteousness until you spend (benevolently) out of what you love; and whatever thing you spend, Allah surely knows it" (Qur-án, iii. 91).

² "And keep up prayer in the two parts of the day and in the first hours of the night; surely good deeds take away evil deeds; this is a reminder to the mindful" (Ibid., xi. 114).

³ "Whoever goes aright, for his own soul does he go aright; and whoever goes astray, to its detriment only does he go astray; nor can the bearer of a burden bear the burden of another, nor do we chastise until We raise an apostle" (Ibid., xvii. 15).

⁴ "And he went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed saying, O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt" (Matt. xxvi. 39).

“ And (as for) the camels, We have made them of the signs of the religion of Allah for you, for you therein is much good; therefore mention the name of Allah on them as they stand in a row, then when they fall down, eat of them and feed the poor man who is contented and the beggar; thus have We made them subservient to you, that you may be grateful.

“ There does not reach Allah their flesh nor their blood, but to Him is acceptable the guarding against evil on your part; thus has He made them subservient to you, that you may magnify Allah because He has guided you aright; and give good news to those who do good (to others).” (Qur-án, xxv. 36-37.)

The concluding portion of the first verse “. . . We made them subservient to you, that you may be grateful . . .” is very portentous. Animality in man urges him to become insubordinate to his God. We should kill the brutal element in us before we can claim real righteousness which is necessary for the health of society. *On the occasion of sacrifice the principle involved becomes dramatized.* Thus the symbol of the institution of sacrifice brings home the real meaning to our eyes. By killing the brute we are reminded to kill the same in us. Whosoever does not know how to do this only commits wrong in destroying a life.

ANGELS

Malak is the equivalent in English of the word *Angel*. It means two things: first, human faculties and other forces working in Nature; secondly, sentient beings who bring these faculties and forces into operation. The Qur-án speaks of angels as “ bodies that work as ordered and engaged to carry out Divine design.”¹

Everything in the dumb world does its assigned work most faithfully. It works, as it were, under the control of some

¹ “ O you who believe! save yourselves and your families from a fire whose fuel is men and stones; over it are angels stern and strong, they do not disobey Allah in what He commands them, and do as they are commanded ” (Qur-án, lxvi. 6).

MILAD ODE TO PROPHET MUHAMMAD

mind.¹ It assumes mathematical exactitude in its movement and exhibits intelligence. This phenomenon, with many other things, compelled modern culture to believe in the existence of God. Things removed from the condition they are placed in, by the hand of Nature, cease to perform their respective functions; but they resume them when brought under the proper handling of the human mind. The Great Mind thus deposes a portion of His work to man. These are His ways. Where lies, then, an impropriety or impossibility if He creates some other minds and deposes them to move the whole unconscious Nature? She does not possess intelligence, though the precision and regularity that characterize her ways indicate the existence of mind. Nature must work, either under the Hand of the Great Mind or some other hands possessing mind. They are the angels of the Qur-án. They are unseen by us. And so is our Creator. Human mind is His creation; so are our bodies that give birth to the former under His designs. Could He not make a similar creation for the time being in the form of those who visited men from time to time, as we read in some books, and brought His messages to His chosen people? I see no impossibility in it.

MILĀD ODE TO THE HOLY PROPHET MUHAMMAD

As long as I've speech, as long as I've sight,
Praise of the Prophet shall be my delight;
Of Allah belov'd, from birth until death,
Greatest of Prophets who ever drew breath,
Higher than all who before him have pass'd,
Greatest of Prophets, the seal and the last!
May eternal Peace on him ever rest,
The last of the Prophets, the greatest and best!

HAROUN M. LÉON, M.A., LL.D., Litt.D.

¹ "Is it then other than Allah's religion that they seek (to follow), and to Him submits whoever is in the heavens and the earth, willingly or unwillingly, and to Him shall they be returned" (Qur-án, iii. 82).

BALANCE SHEET ON MARCH 31, 1930

Norw.—The items in the Sterling Column represent the items in the Indian Currency Column converted at the Rate of Exchange ruling on March 31, 1930, which was 1/34.

We have prepared the above Balance Sheet from the Books and Vouchers of the London Nizamiah Mosque Trust, and from a certified copy of the accounts kept at the Lahore Branch of the Trust, and certify the same is correct and in accordance therewith. We have verified the assets of the Trust.

August 28, 1930.

Signed: GRESHAM, WHITEHEAD & CORMACK,
Chartered Accountants.

36, BASINGHALL STREET, LONDON, E.C.2.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FROM THE DATE OF THE FORMATION OF THE TRUST UNTIL MARCH 31, 1930

NOTE.—The items in the Sterling Column represent the items in the Indian Currency Column converted at the Rate of Exchange ruling on March 1, 1900.

NOTES

NOTES

Church a Broken Reed.

"To-day the Church admits that playing games on Sundays is not necessarily displeasing to God. It should have said that twenty-five years ago.

"In thirty years' time the Church will be quite ready to demonstrate that birth-control is a desirable Christian practice, but who will listen then?

"The tragic thing about the Church of England is that it never gives its blessing to any change of outlook until it is too late to be of any value." (Dr. C. F. Russell in his address at the Modern Churchmen's Conference, Oxford, 1930.)

Dr. Russell went on to say that the reason why the Church of England was regarded with a kind of scornful indifference was because it had surrendered any pretensions it ever had to moral leadership.

This is but one of the ever-multiplying volume of symptoms of "no confidence" in the Church, and his words exactly depict its halting attitude towards all the problems of life. But it could hardly be otherwise. The surprising thing is that any different attitude at all should have been expected from the Church. Jesus Christ did not even bequeath his words to mankind in an impeccable written form, much less leave any definite rules.

In our last month's issue we touched on the ever-changing face of the Church. Dr. Russell comments on this peculiarity as manifested in its attitude towards the institution of Sunday. It is not because the Church has realized that Sunday observance is a pagan institution and that in the early Christian Church there was no Sunday observance. Nor is it because the Church has voluntarily and consciously relaxed the observance of Sunday. It is because it seeks to curry favour with and conciliate youth that has no use for the organized religion of a Church which has ceased to give it any guidance in the conduct of life; and the clergy, to bribe youth, have set themselves to organize the Brighter Church Movement. They offer, for example, picture prizes for Sunday-school attendance; Sunday cricket is organized in churchyards.¹

¹ *Daily Herald*, June 6, 1930.

ISLAMIC REVIEW

It would be worth while to go into the history of Sunday observance.

When the Church had become a State institution the need of holy days began to be felt, and indeed it was essential to give a Christian significance to those of pagan origin which could not be suppressed. The clergy, for example, could not prevent the people in various countries from celebrating a great holiday at Easter, in honour of the Resurrection of Attis and other gods, and they were, therefore, obliged to consent to perpetuate this old custom by giving it a Christian significance.

Thus the festivals of Christmas, Easter, the Feast of the Assumption, the Feast of St. John the Baptist, the Feast of St. George, and the Lenten Feast are all pagan in origin, and were at once clothed in the garb of Christianity.

The origin of the seven-day week, which was adopted by the Jews and certain other peoples, is to be sought in some primitive worship of the moon, for the custom of keeping the day of the New Moon and that of the Full Moon as festivals is found everywhere in antiquity. It implies the recognition of a cycle of about 14 days, of which a week of 7 days is the half; the actual length of a week, thus determined, being $7\frac{2}{3}$ days. The Babylonians had adopted the seven-day week, and their calendar contains directions for abstention from certain secular acts on stated days, which seem to conform to seventh days and were called "Sabbaths." Though the Jewish Sabbath cannot be directly traced to Babylonian usage, the institution is obviously derived from moon-worship, and from the concomitant recognition of the number seven as calendarically sacred. The Jews attributed the holiness of this seventh day to the fact that God was supposed to have rested from His six days' creative labours on that day.

Sunday was dedicated to the Sun, just as the Moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn each had a day dedicated to their worship. Sunday had been for long the holy day in the solar regions of paganism, and it was the day especially revered by the worshippers of Mithra.

Thus the explanation that Jesus had left the tomb on Sunday does not seem to have been the real reason why that day was particularly recognized by the Christians, for they

NOTES

might have selected Friday as the weekly day, that day being the day of his death.

It was as a matter of fact the custom of the pagans, reinforced by the decree of Constantine in 321, that made Sunday a day of rest.

People are now beginning to make holiday on Sunday. They are doing so, not because the Church encourages them, but because they are taking religion into their own hands, which is just the right thing to do. A study of the Gospels shows that Jesus opposed the practice of keeping one day as the day on which all work was tabooed.

Jesus, according to John,¹ actually did risk his life in attempting to emancipate the people from the bondage to formalism of the Jews, who went to such lengths as to kill a person for gathering firewood on the Sabbath.²

One by one the organized strongholds of Christianity are crumbling to dust, and in its frenzy to maintain its hold on the people it has had, perforce, to conform to the views of the people!

Is Democracy a Product of the West?

The Arabic-speaking community of Great Britain was "At Home" in honour of His Excellency Professor Makram Ebeid Bey, on Friday the 29th of August, at the Hotel Metropole, London. His Excellency was Minister of Finance in Nahas Pasha's Egyptian Government, and is now the Secretary-General of the Wafd—the most powerful party in Egypt. He

1 "And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus, and sought to slay him, because he had done these things on the sabbath day. But Jesus answered them, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work. Therefore the Jews sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God" (v. 16-18).

2 "And while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day. And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they put him in ward, because it was not declared what should be done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be surely put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses" (Num. xv. 32-36).

ISLAMIC REVIEW

was one of the members of the Egyptian Delegation that came to England to discuss the Anglo-Egyptian question with the British Government; and was also, it may be recalled, deported with the renowned Zaghlul Pasha, of blessed memory, when they believed that his party was hostile to Great Britain.

Friends of all nationalities—Egyptian, Indian, 'Irāqī, Syrian, Arab, Afghan, and English—came to the "At Home" to evince their sympathy with the cause for which the Wafd party stands.

The guests were entertained to tea, after which, amid cheers, Professor Makram rose to deliver his message, the chair being taken by Maulvī 'Abdu 'l-Majīd, M.A., Imām of the Mosque, Woking, who, after a few introductory remarks to the effect that each one of those present had come not only to honour the person of Professor Makram, who deservedly commands respect, but also to pay homage to him as the symbol of patriotism, said that he was sure that everyone when he left that evening's gathering would go home the richer in ideas.

His Excellency then proceeded to deliver an exceptionally interesting speech in his own eloquent way, in the course of which he refuted a common and quite erroneous idea that democracy is a product of the West and in consequence unsuitable for the East. He said: "It has been objected that democracy is a Western product wholly unsuitable for Eastern consumption. Nothing could be more erroneous. Democracy is not merely understood as an institution but is also felt and practised in the daily life of Orientals. Visitors to the East are fully aware of this.

"The Arabic-speaking community in London, who have done me the honour of asking me to speak at this meeting, know this full well. They live democratically and should be governed in the same manner. Both Christ and his disciples and the Prophet Muhammad and his followers taught and practised democracy.

"A beautiful story is told of the Prophet Muhammad in an authentic 'hadith.' A man saluted him trembling with awe. The Prophet then turned to him and said, 'Why do you tremble, my brother? I am only the son of a woman who ate "alkadeed"'—i.e. meat dried in the sun's heat.

"The Caliphs, as you know, were elected by popular vote.

NOTES

Abu-Bakr, the first Caliph, addressing the people, said, ' You have chosen me as your leader although I am not the best man among you. If I govern well, help me; if not, dismiss me.' The second Caliph, ' Omar, upbraiding 'Amr ibn al-'A's for an act of injustice committed against a Copt of Egypt, said, ' How dare you enslave people whose mothers bore them free?'

" Arabic literature is full of such glorious examples, denoting that democracy is an institution of government and even a habit of thought in Islamic and Arabic countries."

At the request of the Chairman a vote of thanks was proposed by Mr. M. Kamel of Jerusalem, and seconded by Mr. 'Abdullah Yūsuf 'Alī, I.C.S., C.B.E.

The Usefulness of Spiritualism to the World.

Ever since the war the question as to whether Spiritualism has done any good to mankind has been very hotly canvassed, both in the religious and secular worlds. Of the many articles in the daily Press on this subject, two appeared in the *Daily Herald* for July 28 and 29, 1930.

We Muslims, unlike our Christian friends, see a great ally in Spiritualism as a means of arresting the down-grade plunge of the world to the abyss of depravity; for Spiritualism stands for a belief in the Fatherhood of God, the Brotherhood of Man, the continuity of life; for personal responsibility; for compensation and retribution here and hereafter for all the good and evil done on earth; for eternal progression, open to every human soul; and for belief in the Communion of Spirits.

Belief in the Communion of Spirits has given occasion for much chicanery and abuse, but even so Spiritualism is gaining ground every day. There must have been some flaw in the teachings of the Church to render it possible for Spiritualism to arise and make such headway with the people as it has. To our mind that flaw consisted in the vagueness of the teachings of the Church as to the life after death; and secondly, in the peopling of the life hereafter with untold tortures for all those who had failed to do their duty in this life, which considerations naturally led men to deny the existence of such a life. Judging from their writings, Spiritualists have not yet explored the teachings of Islam and especially the writings of Ghazzali and Ibn Arabi. They are as yet ignorant of the esoteric aspect of

ISLAMIC REVIEW

Islam. When they realize it they will find in Islam what they can never find in formal Christianity—a mighty ally. It is a pity that they should try to find justification for their views in the Bible, whose very incompleteness and vagueness was the cause of their growth, and it is high time that they turned their attention to Islam and its teachings.

A system of life, or a religion, which teaches the immortality of the soul is a great asset, and can make the noblest contribution to human life; and Spiritualism has saved many from scepticism and atheism and confirmed their belief in the life hereafter and the existence of God, for which reason it deserves all praise and gratitude. Professor McDougall, in his book *Body and Mind* (New York, 1911), expresses himself on this point thus:

“ Apart from any hope of reward or fear of punishment after death, the belief must have, it seems to me, a moralizing influence upon our thoughts and conduct that we can ill afford to dispense with. The admirable Stoic attitude of a Marcus Aurelius or a Huxley may suffice for those who rise to it in the moral environment created by civilization based upon a belief in a future life and upon other positive religious beliefs, but I gravely doubt whether whole nations could rise to the level of an austere morality or even maintain a decent working standard of conduct after losing their beliefs. A proof that our life does not end with death, though we know nothing of the life beyond the grave, would justify the belief that we have our share in a larger scheme of things than the universe described by physical science, and this conviction must add dignity and seriousness to our lives, and must throw a great weight into the scale against the dangers that threaten every advanced civilization.”

The Gulf between Modern Lay Opinion and Ecclesiastical Theories.

The recommendations and deliberations, both at the Lambeth Conference and subsequently at the Modern Churchmen's Congress, have once more emphasized the difference between lay opinion and that of the Church and the crying need for recognition of the Islamic mode of life.

To take but one example, that all-important social aspect

NOTES

of life—sex and marriage. Everywhere divorce is multiplying in European centres. The debased view of marriage, the flouting of the marriage tie, is debasing the moral standard of Christian countries. Already there are looming up large signs of the decay of family life which is the bedrock of present-day culture.

The accredited leaders of the Church have been stirred from their sleep to action, as usual, because of a growing sense of the alienation of the youth of Europe.

We dealt with the Lambeth Conference in our last issue, but a few words may still be said with advantage on its attempt to solve the problem of sex morals. It says that it believes "that in the exalted view of marriage taught by Our Lord is to be found the solution of the problems with which we are faced." But how? Do not views of this nature leave matters in their practical aspect very much where they were before?

People are not ready to accept the so-much-talked-about "exalted view of marriage taught by Our Lord" without any definite concrete examples. Besides, how can they, when "the Lord" himself failed to take into consideration cases of habitual drunkenness, concealment of mental or physical defects, and brutality?

But a yet more dramatically interesting proposal was made by the Dean of St. Paul's. It must obviously have been made in the desire to save the Church's face. He suggests that those who could not subject themselves to an indissoluble tie as enjoined by the Church should marry in a register office and that such a contract should not be recognized by the Church, and only that form of marriage should be sanctioned by the Church in which the parties take vows for a lifetime. But the question is really: Who can foresee what is in store for him in the future? Who, in such circumstances, would ever go to church to get married? Ordained clergymen, we think! The proposal of the Dean, besides, creates two moral standards. Who is to say which is the higher?

The mess of things which the leaders of the Church are making must in the long run lead to their undoing. No remedy for such a situation can be efficacious other than the recognition of the fact that the marriage tie ought not to be regarded as indissoluble. It should be realized, once for all, as

ISLAMIC REVIEW

in Islam, that with due safeguards, provided by rules and regulations, the tie should be dissoluble, to meet certain contingencies of life; which means that the Islamic idea of the marriage institution will have to be followed if further confusion of moral standards is to be avoided.

To show how closely now the views of the dignitaries and thinkers of the Church follow in the footsteps of Islam we quote from the speeches of Dr. Douglas White, of Harrow, a member of the Archbishops' Commission, on sex relations, and Dr. H. D. A. Major, Principal of Ripon Hall, at the Modern Churchmen's Congress at Oxford. Dr. White said: "Divorce was necessary and it was not forbidden by Christ . . . it should not be a crime, but a method of mending broken lives. There should be no difference between the laws of the Church and the State" (*Evening Standard*, May 20, 1930). Dr. Major said: "To take Christ's teaching about marriage and divorce, which was meant as an ideal, and insist on it being made law, is a gross inconsistency, verging on hypocrisy" (*Evening Standard*, May 20, 1930).

Biographies of Muhammad.

It is very seldom that we find criticism levelled at the fundamental and general principles of conduct as prescribed by Islam. This is not only because they are intelligible to the meanest understanding, but is also due to the fact that even the modern world is anxious to adopt them and incorporate them permanently in its own system of life. On the other hand, however, we often come across books on the market which make a point of portraying the life of the Holy Prophet in an undignified manner, because the enemy, not being able to find any faults in the principles of life as laid down in Islam, imagines that he can vent his malice on the complicated, most interesting, and most comprehensive life of the Prophet, and thus perhaps succeed in depicting Islam as a religion unfit for the world. And it is a fact that this course of action has succeeded partially in this aim.

That the enemy, owing to the advance in learning and the availability of first-hand records of the life of the Prophet, will soon have to retrace its steps from these tactics can be realized by the study of a recent book on the life of the Prophet by

one Dermingham, originally in the French.¹ The book, in common with the European biographies, suffers from some of the old faults, but on the whole is a great improvement on its predecessors.

This reminds us of verses in the Qur-án which speak of the Holy Prophet, with the progress of knowledge, being gradually hailed as the greatest benefactor of mankind.² We, Muslims, cannot expect a complete change all of a sudden. Gradually all misconceptions about the Holy Prophet are being dissipated.

To give our readers an idea of the bulwark of prejudice which a Muslim has to assail in Western countries we reproduce a few quotations from the above-quoted book from its most important chapter entitled "Christianity and Islam":

"The abyss separating the Christians and the Mussulmans did not actually exist between Islam and Christianity. It was only the result of a misunderstanding. Unfortunately, however, misapprehensions were soon engendered and did not stop growing. The People of the Book, although allied with Mahomet at first, refused to recognize him as an authentic prophet. They laughed at this enthusiastic Bedouin; and the Mussulmans in their turn separated themselves as much as possible from Christianity. . . .

"After the war between Islam and Christianity had been going on for centuries the misunderstanding naturally increased, and we are forced to admit that the most serious ones were at first on the side of the Occidentals. At the finish the Byzantine polemist who crushed Islam with their contempt without taking the trouble to study it (with perhaps the exception of St. John of Damascus), the writers and minstrels fought the Saracens with only ridiculous calumnies. They portrayed Mahomet as a camel-thief, a rake, sorcerer, a brigand chief, even as a Roman cardinal furious at not having been elected pope. . . . They showed him to be a false god to whom the faithful made human sacrifices.

"The worthy Guibert de Nogent himself tells us that he dies through excessive drunkenness, and that his corpse was

¹ Routledge, London. 1930. Pp. 352. 158.

² "(Consider) the inkstand and the pen and what they write. By the grace of your Lord you are not mad. And most surely you shall have a reward never to be cut off. And most surely you conform (yourself) to sublime morality" (Qur-án, lxviii. 1-4).

eaten by pigs on a dunghill, explaining why the flesh of this animal and wine are prohibited. . . .

"The opposition of the two religions had not, in the main, any more serious foundations than the affirmations of heroic songs portraying Mahomet, the iconoclast, as a golden idol and the Mussulman mosques as pantheons filled with images. The *Song of Antioch* describes, as if the author had seen it, a massive idol, Mahom, in gold and silver enthroned on the mosaic seat of an elephant. The *Song of Roland*, which shows Charlemagne's horsemen throwing down Mussulman idols, tells us that the Saracens worshipped a trinity composed of Termagant, Mahom, and Apollo. The *Roman de Mahomet* asserts that Islam permitted polyandry. . . .

"Hate and prejudice were tenacious of life. From the time of Rudolph de Ludheim (620) until the present, Nicolas de Cuse, Vivès, Maracci, Hottinger, Bibliander, Prideaux, etc., present Mahomet as an imposter, Islam as the cluster of all the heresies and the work of the devil, the Mussulmans as brutes, and the Koran as the tissue of absurdities. They declined to treat such a ridiculous subject seriously. However, Pierre le Vénérable, author of the first Occidental treatise against Islam, made a Latin translation of the Koran in the twelfth century. Innocent III once called Mahomet Antichrist, although in the Middle Ages he was merely looked upon as a heretic, nearly always. Raymond Lull in the fourteenth century, Guillaume Postel in the sixteenth, Roland and Gagnier in the eighteenth, the Abbé de Broglie and Renan in the ninth, give rather varied opinions. Voltaire, afterwards, amended in several places the hasty judgment expressed in his famous tragedy. Montesquieu, like Pascal and Malebranche, committed serious blunders on the religion, but his views on the manners and customs of the Mussulmans are well considered and often reasonable. Le Comte de Boulainvilliers, Scholl, Caumin de Perceval, Dozy, Sprenger, Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire, de Castries, Carlyle, etc., are generally favourable to Islam and its Prophet and sometimes vindicate him. In 1876, Doughty none the less called Mahomet 'a dirty and perfidious Arab,' while in 1822 Foster declared that 'Mahomet was Daniel's little goat's horn while the Pope was the large one.' Islam still has many ardent detractors."

THE MUSLIM SOCIETY OF GREAT BRITAIN CELEBRATING THE BIRTHDAY OF THE
 HOLY PROPHET MUHAMMAD AT THE HOTEL METROPOLE, NORTHUMBERLAND AVENUE,
 LONDON, W.C. 2, ON TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1930, AT 8. P.M.



At the farthest end of the picture on the dais are seen, from right to left, Maulvī 'Abdu 'l-Majīd, M.A., Imām, The Mosque, Woking; Brigadier-General Blakeney, C.M.G., D.S.O.; Lord Headley, the Chairman of the Society; and Mr. Habeebu 'llah Lovegrove, the Secretary.